

Appendix

See Randolph
**Asia as Primary Target of Communists
 and Necessity of United States Keeping
 Its Word in Vietnam Discussed by Col-
 umnist Carl McCardle in Wheeling,
 W. Va., Intelligencer**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
 OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
 Wednesday, August 18, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, one of our country's dedicated and well-informed journalists, Carl W. McCardle of the Wheeling Intelligencer staff, Wheeling, W. Va., has made significant contributions to the discussions of the Communist movement in general and the Vietnam issue in particular.

Mr. McCardle writes not only as an experienced and respected newsman but, also, from a broad background of service in public affairs and international relations with the U.S. Department of State.

In his Intelligencer column of August 13, 1965, Mr. McCardle recalled his experience in having covered the United Nations for the Philadelphia, Pa., Bulletin, and he quoted appropriately and extensively from a dispatch he filed with that newspaper on November 30, 1950, concerning the performance of the Chinese Communists before the United Nations at that time. He concludes that now, as then, Asia remains the primary target of the Communists.

In a column on August 6, Mr. McCardle wrote convincingly on the theme of the necessity that the United States keep its word in Vietnam. He emphasizes several highly pertinent facts, and especially clarifies two points which seem not to be fully understood.

The first is an answer to the question, "What is the Vietcong?"

Mr. McCardle responds with the observation that "it is not a righteous band of men who, in supposedly justifiable disagreement with the Republic of South Vietnam, is engaged in a civil war with it, as the Reds in their own sinister way, have tried to picture it. The Vietcong is composed of Communists who, after Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel between the Communist north and the free south, went up to North Vietnam for training and then infiltrated into South Vietnam."

The second point of Mr. McCardle's column is that "if this is an American war, it is mainly because the United States is the Red's public enemy No. 1, powerful enough to prevent Communist world domination. And we are not precisely alone, as some persons would have us believe, in combating the Reds in

Vietnam. The Australians, New Zealanders, Filipinos are there and South Korea, which has already sent 2,000 fighting men to help us in South Vietnam, is now sending 15,000 more. Others are there helping, which is a fact that isn't publicized."

The McCardle column on the necessity of the United States keeping its pledge in Vietnam concluded with the declaration that President Johnson knows the stakes are high, and with this forecast:

If the Reds win in Vietnam—which they won't—then they would go on to try to get southeast Asia, the Rice Bowl of Asia with its riches, such as tin and rubber and other products the Communist need. If they were to succeed in southeast Asia, then you could more or less say goodbye to all of Asia, and the American defense line in the Pacific against the Communist aim of world dominance.

Mr. President, the two McCardle columns are meaningful and helpful contributions to the discussions by our citizens which appropriately are taking place throughout the country on these vital issues. In this interest and concern, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the articles from the Wheeling Intelligencer.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer,
 Aug. 6, 1965]

**CITES NECESSITY OF UNITED STATES KEEPING
 ITS WORD IN VIET**

(By Carl W. McCardle)

I am writing this column well in advance of formal reports scheduled to be made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara on Vietnam.

I would hope that Secretaries Rusk and McNamara would say that the United States is not going to give way in Vietnam and that we will do what is necessary to drive the Reds back to where they belong above the 17th parallel from which they invaded South Vietnam. I would also personally welcome it if the two U.S. officials make clear that the outcome in the Vietnam struggle is of vital interest to the future of the United States.

Should the United States go back on its word made as I recall around 1954 by President Eisenhower that the United States would protect the territorial integrity of free South Vietnam, then no free country anywhere would rely with confidence on U.S. assurance against the Communist menace, especially in Asia.

The same would have been true if President Eisenhower had not fulfilled similar safeguards elsewhere which had become American policy under Democratic Presidents. It is part of the greatness of the United States that on foreign affairs, the members of both political parties, always with some exception—and the right of dissent has likewise been a source of the towering stature of the United States—respectfully supported the President.

I had to laugh when the Communist regime of North Vietnam, solemnly announced on Sunday that it is ready to respond to a call for help from the Vietcong to fight the Americans in South Vietnam. This is psychological twaddle.

The highly trained 325th Vietnam Division is already in South Vietnam, as well as other contingents.

And what is the Vietcong, anyway? It is not a righteous band of men who, in supposedly justifiable disagreement with the Republic of South Vietnam, is engaged in a "civil war" with it, as the Reds in their own sinister way, have tried to picture it.

The Vietcong are Communists who, after Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel between the Communist North and the free South, went up to North Vietnam for training and then infiltrated into South Vietnam.

I am personally surprised and proud that our fighting men so far have done, along with the South Vietnamese troops, so well during the monsoon or rainy season in Vietnam. They have had their problems, but theirs, as it has turned out to date, haven't been so damaging as the Communists have experienced.

It had been predicted that the Vietcong, well acquainted with the rainy season, would take advantage of that period, which lasts roughly for a little more than 4 months, through June and on through September, to mount a big offensive that would knock us out. They haven't been able to do that. Instead they have suffered heavy losses, and haven't, in the monsoon, gained one bit of territory. And the U.S. air raids in North Vietnam have done a good job. I still don't believe that Red China, or Soviet Russia, will actively get into the Vietnam war. They've been saying they would for months. If this is an American war, it is mainly because the United States is the Reds' public enemy No. 1, powerful enough to prevent Communist world domination. And we are not precisely alone in combating the Reds in Vietnam. The Australians, New Zealanders, Filipinos are there and South Korea which has already sent 2,000 fighting men to help us in South Vietnam, are now sending 15,000 more.

Others are there helping which isn't publicized.

The United States has more than 80,000 troops in Vietnam. This will increase to 125,000 or more. President Johnson knows that the stakes are high. If the Reds win in Vietnam, which they won't, then they would go on to try to get southeast Asia, the rice bowl of Asia with its other riches, such as tin and rubber and other products the Communists need. If they were to succeed in southeast Asia, then you could more or less say goodbye to Asia, and to the American defense line in the Pacific against the Communist aim of world dominance.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer,
 Aug. 13, 1965]

**ASIA REMAINS PRIMARY TARGET OF
 COMMUNISTS**

(By Carl W. McCardle)

"Back in Washington, after a trip to the United Nations to watch the great Chinese Communist performance everybody has been telling us to calm down, not to get excited.

"Maybe so.

"But at the moment we happen to think that too many people, including too many

A4617

officials and generals, have been too calm too long, and it is time that we all get just a little bit excited.

"It could be that Gen. Wu Hsiu-chuan, the Chinese Communist mouthpiece at the U.N., unhinged us somewhat. But we know that anyone who listened to Wu's 2-hour exercise in vilification with the United States his villain, can no longer be complacent about the mortal fix that we are in.

"As is usual with the aggressors of this century, Wu laid out the blueprint, and also as usual probably few people will believe that he could mean what he clearly meant. He said:

"One of the master planners of Japanese aggression, Tanaka, once said: 'To conquer the world, one must first conquer Asia; to conquer Asia, one must first conquer China; to conquer China, one must first conquer Manchuria and Mongolia; to conquer Manchuria and Mongolia one must first conquer Korea and Formosa.'"

"That's just about the way the Communists are doing it, isn't it? Wu didn't say that, of course. He was citing the quotation as a text for his brazen thesis that this is the goal of the American imperialists.

"As for us, we are ready to read it just the way Hitler could always be read, and realize just what the Communists are up to. From now on we happen to think that anybody who tries to rationalize the Chinese Communists in any way except that they are eager-beaver accomplices of Russia is very foolish, indeed.

"As a correspondent, we heard the Nazi supermen spouting their hateful propaganda in the thirties, and for what seems to be a large part of our life now we have been on the scene to hear Molotov and Vishinsky, Gromyko and Malik spout the same kind of propaganda at Lake Success, Paris, London, and Moscow. But we must admit that we have never allowed ourselves to get so downright mad over any of these outrages as we did over the show put on by Ambassador--as he has the effrontery to call himself--Wu.

"The whole business was a disgrace to decent people everywhere.

"Here was this special agent of the world's tyranny, invited by the U.N. Security Council, to come to Lake Success, and 10 peace-loving diplomats had to sit there in polite silence while he audaciously called the United States every name in the book almost; imputed to us all the predatory motives that the Communists have; and, with a flourish, insulted the President of the United States. The 11th diplomat, Russia's Malik, naturally was highly pleased, leaning back in his chair self-satisfied and smug.

"After the bizarre ordeal was over, we asked a top ranking American official how he managed to remain silent through it all, to take it from this guest-star liar, without rising up and walking out of the meeting in disgust, with a parting assertion that this Peiping intruder should be thrown out of the U.N. premises, and out of the country.

"The American said it was all he could do to remain quiet.

"We then asked a British diplomat how he felt about it. (The British have recognized the Chinese Communist regime, and have felt that the Chinese Communists should be seated in the U.N. and then perhaps they could be wooed away from Russia.)

"He was a bit hysterical, I must say," said our English friend about Wu."

This rather long quote is from my favorite author--myself, of course.

It is excerpted from a column of mine that was published on the opposite editorial page of the Philadelphia Bulletin. The date of its appearance in the Bulletin was some time ago. It was November 30, 1950. I was then chief of the Bulletin's Washington bureau. I had gone up to New York to report

the story of the hearing by the U.N. Security Council of a delegation of Red Chinese observers, headed by Ambassador Wu.

Soviet Russia had insisted that the Communist regime on the Chinese mainland have the observers on hand at the U.N. Security Council when the matter of which regime--the Communists on the mainland or the Nationalists on Formosa--should represent China in the U.N. was debated.

Soviet Russia and Red China were then close allies. Some experts say that they are not so close now. Perhaps yes; perhaps no. In my opinion a Communist is a Communist. And I think that if there has been a break between Russia and Red China it was brought about by the so-called softer line taken by Khrushchev. Mao Tse-tung, the bossman of the Chinese Communists, was and is an old Stalinist. In my viewpoint a major factor in the surprise ouster of Khrushchev was that he seemed to be pursuing a course that might lead to an open showdown with Red China, which the Communist masters did not want on either side.

Red China, after Professor Wu's exhibition of what a nonaggressive, peace-loving regime he was speaking for, never has gained admission to the U.N.

I should perhaps point out that the U.N. was then housed in temporary quarters called Lake Success, which was somewhat ironical for various reasons including the fact that there was not even a lake there. Later the U.N.'s imposing own headquarters were built.

In my November 30, 1950, column I said that some "reexamining could be done with great usefulness in respect to our top command in Korea."

I wrote: "Word here in Washington is that 'Intelligence' fell down and that led General MacArthur to be lured into the Chinese Communist trap." I said that I had seen an appraisal of our "Intelligence at the time" 2 days before MacArthur jumped off on his win the war and get the boys home by Christmas offensive. The intelligence report said that the Chinese Communists "were building up menacing reserves in Manchuria." The record shows that on November 26, 1950, some 200,000 Chinese Communist "volunteers crossed the Yalu River into North Korea."

General MacArthur was relieved of his command by President Truman on April 11, 1951, for not clearing statements by him through the Defense Department. But on behalf of General MacArthur it should be said that he was aged 70 then and had before his downfall performed brilliantly in Korea.

The point of this essay is that for a long time the Communist have regarded Asia as the primary battleground. And the reason they did not succeed completely in Korea, one of the places mentioned in Professor Wu's blueprint, was that the United States and other countries resisted them with force and they were finally stopped at the 38th parallel from which they had begun their invasion. And as for Formosa, also mentioned by Dr. Wu, the United States has made it very clear it will use force to repel any attack upon Formosa.

Prior to its inception, this was one of the most controversial issues of our time. Today it is hailed as one of the most beneficial programs our Nation has ever inaugurated.

The significance of social security is well depicted in articles which appeared in two leading newspapers in Buffalo, N.Y. Under unanimous consent, I include the following articles from the Buffalo Courier-Express, dated August 14, entitled "Social Security Observes 30th Birthday," and from the Buffalo Evening News, dated August 14, entitled "Social Security Marks 30th Year of Service":

SOCIAL SECURITY MARKS 30TH YEAR OF SERVICE

The country's most sweeping attack on old-age poverty and helpless dependency was made 30 years ago when on August 14, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act. The act provided only bare minimum coverage to many elderly persons during its first few years but it did provide some measure of independence for elderly citizens who labored all of their lives but were unable to build up a retirement nest egg.

While the Social Security Act passed both Houses by overwhelming majorities it was attacked on many sides as confiscatory and socialistic by those who opposed it. Further, there was a question as to the constitutionality of the act and this question was not cleared up until the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on it almost 2 years later.

How great an impact it has had on the Nation can be understood when one realizes that 76 million workers now are covered by the act and about 20 million presently are receiving benefits up to \$135.90 a month with additional increases coming along until 1971 when the top payment will be \$167.90 a month.

Insurance and retirement plans have been written around this act and its coverage has been extended to include medical and hospital care for retirees at a time when they need such protection the most. This phase will not become effective until next year and still is meeting bitter opposition from some quarters.

In view of the success of the original plan and its amendments we cannot help but wonder what the opposition will be, or if there will be any, 30 years from now.

SOCIAL SECURITY MARKS 30TH YEAR OF SERVICE—PROGRAM SERVES 20 MILLION BENEFICIARIES WITH BROADENED COVERAGE AND BENEFITS

Social security marks its 30th birthday today with many happy returns from 20 million beneficiaries.

About 112,000 are in Erie County. Since President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the original bill August 14, 1935, social security coverage has been broadened and its benefits increased.

The original legislation has been amended nine times, most recently this year to increase benefits 7 percent, and to provide health insurance for the elderly, starting next July 1.

Costs have risen as coverage was broadened. Thus, the new amendments raise the rate deduction to 4.2 percent up to \$6,800 annually, starting January 1, 1966. In the original law, it was 1 percent of the first \$3,000.

Western New York social security offices reflect this growth.

FIRST CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1937

First social security contributions were made January 1, 1937. The Buffalo office had four employees covering Erie, Cattaraugus, Niagara, Genesee, and Wyoming Counties.

Much of the early work involved issuing social security cards. First benefits were paid

Social Security Observes 30th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this month, 30 years ago, our Nation saw the birth of the social security program.

August 18, 1965

someday, perhaps by an action of the United States, France, Britain, or even someone else, might get "a finger on the nuclear trigger." British Prime Minister Wilson, walking a knife-edge margin in Parliament, is publicly pledged to prevent that.

The Soviets are out to prevent any kind of NATO nuclear force. They now can be counted on to add the British reservations to the American draft treaty to their own arguments against it, even though Lord Chalfont officially welcomed the U.S. draft as a basis for discussion.

Ge. David Lawrence
Trade With West Bolsters Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the recent talk of increasing trade with the Communist bloc and the supposed benefits that would be gained politically and economically, columnist David Lawrence, in the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1965, clearly sums up the problems of trade with the Communist bloc. He particularly shows the effect such trade is having on the United States and Vietnam.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the column by Mr. Lawrence for inclusion in the Record:

TRADE WITH WEST BOLSTERS REDS

(By David Lawrence)

Which is more important—to make money for oneself in trading with an enemy or to help save human lives?

Everybody would say at once that it is obviously better to avert bloodshed and end any war that's going on. But when this is applied in practice, it turns out that many individuals in various countries, hitherto allied with us, have a greater passion for dollars or pounds or francs or marks or pesos.

There wouldn't be a war in Vietnam today and American boys wouldn't be fighting and dying in a far-off land if the nations of the world whom the United States has befriended and to whom it continues year after year to send billions of dollars of aid took a stand in support of the American position in Vietnam.

There would be a different story to tell if trade with Red China were cut off by the free world, and if the Soviets saw that the same thing would happen to them should they keep on siding with North Vietnam by building missile sites there and sending weapons to be used to kill American soldiers and airmen. The Russian people, if they knew the facts, would not go along with the Red Chinese.

Perhaps the Johnson administration has failed to be realistic about the situation. The President has said that he has ample authority to send American armed forces to southeast Asia under the resolution passed by both Houses of Congress on August 10, 1964.

But, while this is true, Congress has not formally declared "a state of war," which is recognized in international law as requiring all nations to refrain from sending contraband goods to the belligerents under penalty of seizure or confiscation of shipments of such commodities.

Red China is in every sense a cobelligerent with North Vietnam. The Vietcong couldn't last a month if forces and weapons were not

supplied directly or indirectly by the Communist regime in Peiping.

But what is the news that the American people read in the headlines this week? Canada has announced that it has just completed a deal to sell \$450 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Government. This illustrates the importance placed on international trade and the dependence of the Communist bloc on trade with the free world.

It has been argued that more trade will produce better relations with the Communist regimes, and a new scheme now is being pushed here to sell vast quantities of U.S. wheat to Communist countries, especially in Eastern Europe.

Much of the American grain which would be shipped to the Communists in Eastern Europe or elsewhere has been bought and paid for by U.S. taxpayers through the farm-subsidy program. The Chicago Tribune says editorially:

"If the sale is approved, we will be selling wheat to Communists at 75 cents a bushel less than American flour millers have to pay for it. And if Congress authorizes the administration's new wheat program, the Communists next year will be able to buy our wheat at \$1.25 a bushel less than it is sold for food in this country. In other words, the administration proposes to sell our wheat to Communists at the low world price while at the same time it is asking Congress to boost the price of domestic wheat for food to double the world price—which means American consumers would have to pay higher prices for wheat foods—for example, 2 cents a loaf more for bread.

"Moreover, we are beginning to hear that inasmuch as our grain sales to Russia simply free Russian grain for export to Red China and Cuba, we might as well get in on this trade directly. Not mentioned is the argument that if we did not sell grain to Russia, it would have less grain to supply Red China and Cuba. And if we sell to Red China, why not ship food directly to North Vietnam, even though it is directing a war against us and killing Americans in South Vietnam?

"Although grain is not usually classified as 'strategic material' in the sense of arms and ammunition, it certainly becomes strategic when our enemies are hungry and can't feed themselves."

So it comes back to the same old question: Which is more important—to make money for oneself or to help save human lives, especially American lives? The war the United States is fighting in Vietnam has a worthy purpose and winning it can do a great deal to prevent further acts of aggression and to preserve world peace. But if, as in the 1930s, private greed supersedes the interests of the people as a whole, the world may again see a global conflict. For it was the failure of the embargo on oil against Mussolini in 1935 and the flagrant indifference of the nations of Europe to the plea of President Roosevelt in 1937 for a quarantine or economic embargo against Hitler that brought on the very conditions which made World War II inevitable.

Cheering the Bull**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1965

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of August 10 there appeared a rather interesting commentary concerning the approach of certain Peruvian Indians to their agricultural problems. It reports:

PERUVIAN INDIANS BLOCK HELP FOR GORED TORERO

LIMA, PERU (Reuters).—Indian peasants in Canas Province expect an excellent harvest because of the death of a bullfighter and the serious goring of seven spectators.

Recent reports said a large crowd cheered the death of the bullfighter, Pepe Huanca, from a stomach wound after he was tossed by a bull. The Indians believe that the death of a torero means good harvests and increased wool crop. Seven spectators who jumped into the ring to aid the torero were gored by the bull.

Local authorities were unable to stop the bullfight because of the Indians' hostility, the reports said.

If we shared the superstitions of these Peruvian Indians, I suppose we might conclude that this legislative exhibition augured great things for American agriculture.

If a bloodied and beleaguered sacrifice portends prosperity, we surely have conjured up about as much as we can take at one time.

For in the course of consideration of this conglomerate agriculture bill, we have watched the interests of the American farmer in effigy, butted and rebutted, gored and trampled and ground into submission, and every effort to try to save him has been hostily turned back by unyielding numbers.

It has been quite a performance, and there can be no doubt about it—again, the bull has prevailed. Indeed, we see reaffirmed the old observation that "cows may come, and cows may go; but the bull goes on forever."

Who Speaks for Iowa's Agricultural Producers? ***EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an excellent editorial regarding a recommendation by the American Farm Bureau Federation that the interest rate on future REA loans to rural electric cooperatives be raised.

The editorial, which appeared in the May 1965 issue of Current News, a monthly publication of the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative, follows:

LOCAL, NATIONAL POLICIES DIFFER

The American Farm Bureau Federation on April 29 recommended to Congress that the interest rate on future REA loans to rural electric cooperatives be raised to "the cost of long-term funds to the Federal Government" or more than double the present 2-percent rate.

This position is similar to that taken by the power companies, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and other REA critics.

Your cooperative was quite shocked to learn that the American Farm Bureau Federation (through its spokesman John C. Lynn, legislative director) should make such a proposal to the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Committee.

were so small that the only value their protest had was that of furnishing some new fodder for the Communists around the world. Reports that went to the Reds abroad no doubt magnified the numbers of those on hand and hauling off a few limp demonstrators against the U.S. policy in Vietnam probably was dubbed police brutality by Communist propagandists.

Here at home, however, it was apparent that the Assembly of Unrepresented People did not represent many people in this country. The people they represented were our enemies all over the world.

GET CONGRESS HOME

The view of a segment of Washington, at least, is that the President has been surprised by the speed with which some parts of his program have been enacted, even though in the past they have been considered highly controversial.

The President apparently did not know his own strength.

Aid to local schools, medicare, even subsidized rent, not only get the approval of Congress, but there is talk in that body of ways the original plans can be broadened and extended.

Only a few items remain on the President's list of musts as he submitted them originally to Congress. Before he lets the Members go home, he will doubtless get them. It is not part of the Johnson technique to take the pressure off when he has everything rolling his way.

All of this means that the best interests of the country will be served by as early a return home by Congress as is possible. Any Congress which voluntarily yields its right to perform as a coequal part of the Federal Establishment, as this one has, is a continuing threat to the Nation.

Progress at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY and others have recently pointed out, there is no greater threat to the future of mankind than the impending proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It is difficult for those of us who are not experts to understand the significance of negotiations in this field. Apparently, the proposals just made in Geneva by the administration are far more important than has been generally recognized.

This morning's Washington Post contained two articles on this subject which underline the significance of the U.S. proposal. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith these perceptive and enlightening articles:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 18, 1965]

PROGRESS AT GENEVA

(By Joseph Kraft)

Anybody can sing a dirge on the draft treaty against the further spread of nuclear weapons that this country presented yesterday at Geneva. The Russians are not about to sign. France and China are not even in the conference. And the draft is only a piece of paper anyhow.

Even so, the draft is probably the biggest step toward peace since the test ban treaty of 2 years ago. Indeed, its mere existence confirms the President's growing mastery over forces and pressures that have previously slowed or blunted almost all conciliatory proposals of the United States.

Up to now, discussion of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons was everybody's favorite excuse for braying insults. That fatal temptation could be seen even in the relatively mild sessions of the present Geneva meetings.

The Russians kicked off by saying that the price for a treaty was that this country abandon Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, and West Germany. The American delegate retorted that the Russians were using the talks as a cover "for the form of aggression they call wars of national liberation." The most important neutrals at Geneva—India, Sweden, and Egypt—thereupon declared that they would make no commitments until the Big Two settled down to the realities.

The treaty draft at least gets the subject down to realities. It indicates what is required, from big countries and small, if early and rapid proliferation of nuclear weapons is to be prevented. Diplomats would not be diplomats if they were not adept at avoiding the subject. But from here on in, when nonproliferation is the subject, the world will know who is talking seriously and who is merely sprouting propaganda.

In working out the draft, moreover, the White House asserted primacy over two power centers in the West that, for good reasons of their own, have usually been against conciliatory moves. The West Germans, for one, have feared that a nonproliferation agreement would foreclose their chance to participate in NATO decisions on nuclear weapons. A section of the State Department has always wanted to humor Bonn on the grounds that otherwise vicious nationalism would reassert itself in German politics.

For years, the combination of Bonn and Foggy Bottom has been slowly diluting proposals favored by determined Presidents. With German elections set for September 19, and with little chance that the Russians would sign anything, another victory for the combination looked like a sure bet. But two happy circumstances, and a large dose of maneuvering skill, made it possible for the White House to beat the odds.

The first happy circumstance was the speech calling for a nonproliferation treaty, by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of June 23. The speech drew widespread and favorable attention, including endorsement from the nuclear deans of the Senate, CLINTON P. ANDERSON and JOHN O. PASTORE. The President, in effect, was on his mettle to produce. Next day, with an intimation that it would brook no foot-dragging by the State Department, the White House requested proposals for a draft treaty from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

As to the second happy circumstance, for domestic political reasons the British Government had been longing to take a new initiative in disarmament. In eagerness to engage the Russians, the British, on July 26, came up with a plan that would have cut out the Germans entirely from a voice in NATO nuclear affairs. Such a plan, had it been put forward as a formal proposal at Geneva, would probably have blown the alliance to bits.

With that threat in the air, the United States was under even more pressure to come up with a draft treaty, while the Germans, for once, had to make concessions. After 2 weeks of behind-the-scenes talks, the Germans, and the British came round to a plan that continues an option for German participation in NATO nuclear decisions even if a nonproliferation treaty is reached. That, in effect, is the American draft treaty proposal.

The end result is that a door once locked tight is now slightly ajar. If that gain looks

minimal, the fact is that, just as in the test ban, the Russians may, any time, walk through the door.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 18, 1965]

SOVIET OBJECTION OBSCURES U.S. SHIFT ON NUCLEAR ISSUE

(By Murray Marder)

Prompt and expected Soviet objection yesterday to the U.S. draft treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons obscured the fact that it marked a public change in the American position.

In the proposal, the United States in fact did agree to a new kind of limitation on what the Soviet Union publicly objects to most: the development of a nuclear force inside the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Under the new language, according to American officials, such a force could not evolve into an organization with "independent power to use nuclear weapons" unless a present nuclear nation contributed all of its weapons to it.

HOPES PUT ON MLF

The United States, particularly at West Germany's urging, always has been anxious to keep open the possibility that the now dormant and disputed multilateral nuclear force, or anything like it, someday might evolve into an independent Western European nuclear force.

That possibility is still open under the new language, but only if either Britain, France, or the United States would surrender their present national nuclear forces to the joint force.

That comes about through some delicately contrived phraseology, originally largely British in origin, in the key article I of the U.S. Draft Treaty:

"Each of the nuclear states party to this treaty undertakes not to transfer any nuclear weapons into the national control of any non-nuclear state, either directly, or indirectly through a military alliance; and each undertakes not to take any other action which would cause an increase in the total number of states and other organizations having independent power to use nuclear weapons."

WOULD PUT CEILING AT FIVE

The United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and Communist China now are the world's nuclear members. The intention of the draft treaty is to make that number of five the ceiling on the world nuclear grouping of either nations or organizations.

In other words, in order for there to be a veto-free NATO nuclear force, the United States, Britain, or France would have to surrender the "independent power to use nuclear weapons."

The United States, with its massive nuclear power, surely will not do so. France, at least under President de Gaulle, is adamant about retaining its nuclear force. Therefore, it is said, Britain, under this proposal, would hold the key to determine if a veto-free NATO force might ever evolve, because NATO then would in effect replace Britain as the world's fifth nuclear power.

Even so, Britain dissented. The reason given in Geneva yesterday by chief British negotiator Lord Chalfont was that the draft treaty "does not rule out the possibility that an association of states could by a majority decision use nuclear weapons."

While that possibility may be only theoretical, Lord Chalfont said, Britain would prefer "this door be closed."

In other words, he said, he wanted to assure that if a nuclear nation gave up its nuclear deterrent and joined a federation of states, that federation could not have independent control over nuclear weapons.

FEAR OF GERMANY CITED

A major reason for that stand is continuing popular concern in Britain that Germany